

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/706,522	1	1/12/2003	Richard Kingsley Stuart JR.	80050US02 (KDK)	7693	
23589	7590	06/20/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HOVEY W			SZEKELY,	SZEKELY, PETER A		
2405 GRAND BLVD., SUITE 400 KANSAS CITY, MO 64108				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			1714	.	
				DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/706,522	STUART ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Peter Szekely	1714					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 M	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 May 2006</u> .						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 15-43</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 15-43</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified cobies not receive	u.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate atent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/12/03,3/1//04</u> .	6) Other:						

Page 2

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no mention in the specification of an oxidized polyolefin having a polar functional group.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

 Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor

Art Unit: 1714

and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo et al. 5,206,275, Sakai et al. 5,856,386 or Weier et al. 6,875,808.
- 6. Kubo et al. disclose crosslinkers in the Abstract, oxidized polyethylene in column 5, lines 5-6 and pellets in column 5, lines 10-14. Sakai et al. teach crosslinking agents in claims 1 and 8, oxidized polyethylene in column 10, line 38 and pellets in column 12, line 31. Weier et al. recite oxidized polyolefins in column 8, lines 21-22, crosslinkers in column 12, line 22 and pellets in column 13, line 56. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art; at the time the invention was made, to select applicants' ingredients from a list of equivalents.
- 7. Claims 4, 5, 8-11, 16, 18-28, 33, 34, 40, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al. 2004/0127614.
- 8. Jiang et al. display crosslinking agents in paragraphs 0449 and 0533, oxidized polyolefins in paragraph 0450, elastomers in paragraphs 0456-0460, asphalt in paragraphs 0767, 800 and 0905 and claim 314 and a paving composition in paragraphs 0937-0973 and claims 348-359. All properties are inherent in the composition. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art; at the time the invention was made, to select applicants' ingredients from a list of equivalents.

Page 4

Art Unit: 1714

9. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andriolo 2004/0054038.

10. Andriolo reveals a vulcanizing agent in form of pellets in claim 1, binder, sulphur and additives in claim 2, polyethylene as binder in claim 6 and elastomer as additive in claim 7. Contacting with bitumen can be found in claims 13-18 and Examples 1 and 2. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art; at the time the invention was made, to select applicants' ingredients from a list of equivalents.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 11. Claims 37-39 and 41 are allowed.
- 12. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 15, 17, 29-32 and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Double Patenting

13. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1714

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

14. Claims 1-12 and 15-43 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6-11 and 15-48 of copending Application No. 10/706,454. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the ingredients are the same and the concentrations overlap.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is (571) 272-1124. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m. Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peter Szekely Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

P.S. 6/14/06